More Communication with Less Entanglement

Pankaj Agrawal,[1,*] Satyabrata Adhikari,[1,†] and Sumit Nandi[1,‡]

[1]*Institute of Physics, Sainik School Post, Bhubaneswar-751005, Orissa, India*

(Dated: December 23, 2015)

We exhibit the intriguing phenomena of "Less is More" using a set of multipartite entangled states. We consider the quantum communication protocols for the *exact* teleportation, superdense coding, and quantum key distribution. We find that sometimes *less* entanglement is *more* useful. To understand this phenomena we obtain a condition that a resource state must satisfy to communicate a n-qubit pure state which has m terms. We find that an appropriate partition of the resource state should have a von-Neumann entropy of $\log_2 m$. Furthermore, it is shown that some states may be suitable for *exact* superdense coding, but not for *exact* teleportation.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.67 Hk, 03.65.Bz

arXiv:1409.1810v2 [quant-ph] 22 Dec 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

The entanglement has been used as a quantum resource to carry out a number of communication tasks such as teleportation [1], superdense coding [2], telecloning [3], secret sharing [4], quantum-key distribution (QKD) [5–7]. The entangled resource state may have bipartite or multipartite entanglement. A number of protocols which were first introduced in the context of a bipartite system can be extended to a multipartite system. However, in the case of multipartite systems, the nature of entanglement is still not fully understood [8]. Also, there can be many variants and extensions of such protocols in this new setting. The multipartite entangled states can be classified according to various schemes [9–11]. Different classes exhibit different types of entanglement properties. In this letter, we examine a set of four-qubit states that belong to different categories according to SLOCC [12] classification. We use these states to explore some of the variations of the bipartite protocols. Such studies may even allow a better understanding of multiparticle entanglement and classification of quantum states according to their ability to carry out a specific task. SLOCC classification is not a useful guide for the suitability of a state to be a resource state for a specific task [13].

We are interested in the *exact* teleportation, superdense coding and quantum key distribution. These tasks may be carried out nonmaximally. A multiqubit state shared by two parties, allows many possibilities. A resource state is suitable for *exact* teleportation if it can be used to teleport a n-qubit state with m terms, for some m and n, with unit probability and unit fidelity. By *exact* superdense coding we mean the ability to communicate $n+1$ or higher integral values of classical bits by transmitting n qubits. For the case of quantum key distribution, one should be able to generate a key using the resource state. We use von Neumann entropy of the subsystems as a tool for our investigations. We note that one would need a task-oriented maximally entangled state (TMES) [14] to carry out a task maximally. A prescription was given in [14] to construct such TMESs.

* agrawal@iopb.res.in
† tapisatya@gmail.com
‡ sumit@iopb.res.in

In this paper, we consider a set of four-qubit states and show that larger entanglement is not always more useful for some communication tasks. There has been some discussion of this issue in the literature [15, 16]. Our investigations would lead us to ask the question: Given a resource state, what unknown states can be teleported exactly ? Or, given a state to be teleported, what are the minimum requirement for the resource state ?

We consider the following inequivalent quadripartite entangled states of qubits in terms of SLOCC [12],

$$|GHZ\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle), \quad (1)$$

$$|W\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0001\rangle + |0010\rangle + |0100\rangle + |1000\rangle), \quad (2)$$

$$|\Omega\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0000\rangle + |0110\rangle + |1001\rangle - |1111\rangle), \quad (3)$$

$$|S_1\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0000\rangle + |0101\rangle + |1000\rangle + |1110\rangle), \quad (4)$$

$$|S_2\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0000\rangle + |1011\rangle + |1101\rangle + |1110\rangle). \quad (5)$$

These states have genuine quadripartite entanglement in the sense that they cannot be written as product states in any partition. Among these five entangled states, only $|GHZ\rangle$ and $|W\rangle$ states are symmetric with respect to the permutation of qubits; thus any quantum information task performed using these states is independent of distribution of particles among the parties. The $|\Omega\rangle$ state is the cluster state introduced by Briegel and Raussendorf [18]. This state has been discussed extensively in the context of one-way quantum computation.

It will be useful to catalog the von Neumann entropy (henceforth, called entropy) of all the bipartite partitions of theses states. The entropy for a state ρ is defined as $S(\rho) = -\mathrm{Tr}(\rho \log_2(\rho))$. We have four-qubit states. We can label these qubits as "$1, 2, 3, 4$". Then ρ_1 is the reduced density matrix of the qubit with label '1'; ρ_{12} is the reduced density matrix of the qubits with labels '1' and '2' and so on. In a bipartite partition, both subsystems of four-qubits will have identical entropies. For example, $S(\rho_1) = S(\rho_{234})$, $S(\rho_{12}) = S(\rho_{34})$ etc. This can be seen by considering the Schmidt decomposition of the states.

In Table I, we list the entropies of the subsystems for the above five states.

States	$S(\rho_1)$	$S(\rho_2)$	$S(\rho_3)$	$S(\rho_4)$	$S(\rho_{12})$	$S(\rho_{13})$	$S(\rho_{14})$
GHZ	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ω	1	1	1	1	2	2	1
W	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	1	1	1
S_1	0.81	1	0.81	0.81	1.5	1.22	1.22
S_2	0.81	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5

Table I: Entropies of the subsystems

When the four-qubit system is partitioned into '1' and '234' parts, then each subsystem will have entropy $S(\rho_1)$; for the partition '14' and '23', each subsystem will have entropy $S(\rho_{14})$. Other entries of the table can be understood in the similar manner. In our analysis of above four-qubit states, these entropies will play an important role. In fact, the success of various protocols depends on the values of these entropies.

II. TELEPORTATION AND ENTROPY

With a four-qubit resource state, one can look for teleporting one-qubit, two-qubit, or three-qubit unknown states with varying number of terms. As we shall see, usefulness of a resource state would depend on the entropies of its subsystems. For maximal teleportation, a subsystem must have maximal entropy. For non-maximal teleportation, smaller entanglement is enough.

Let us consider first when Alice wishes to teleport an unknown qubit state $|\psi\rangle_a = \alpha|0\rangle_a + \beta|1\rangle_a$ to Bob. The qubits of the resource states are distributed in such a way that Bob will have one qubit and Alice the rest. To find the usefulness of a resource state, one can look at the entropies of the subsystems. For any type of teleportation to succeed, the entropy of the Bob's qubit needs to be one. With the $|GHZ\rangle$ state the teleportation protocol will work for any distribution of the particles because all individual qubits of a $|GHZ\rangle$ state have unit entropy. The $|\Omega\rangle$ state is not symmetric under the permutations of qubits. Still, the teleportation would succeed regardless of which qubit Bob has because all individual qubits have entropy as one. For example, let Alice has the qubits 1, 2, 3 and Bob has the qubit 4. The combined state of the the five qubits can be rewritten as

$$|\psi\rangle_a|\Omega\rangle_{1234} = [|\Omega_1^+\rangle_{a123}\sigma_0|\psi\rangle_4 + |\Omega_1^-\rangle_{a123}\sigma_3|\psi\rangle_4 + |\Omega_2^+\rangle_{a123}\sigma_1|\psi\rangle_4 + |\Omega_2^-\rangle_{a123}i\sigma_2|\psi\rangle_4]/2,$$

where $|\Omega_1^\pm\rangle = (|00\rangle|\varphi^+\rangle \pm |11\rangle|\varphi^-\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, $|\Omega_2^\pm\rangle = (|01\rangle|\varphi^-\rangle \pm |10\rangle|\varphi^+\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\varphi^\pm\rangle = (|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. With these measurement vectors, the teleportation protocol can be carried out with two cbit of classical communication [17].

One cannot teleport the state $|\psi\rangle_a$ using $|W\rangle$ state as a resource state since none of the qubits has entropy as one. However, the $|W_{mn}\rangle$ state of [13, 17] can be used for the teleportation. The $|S_1\rangle$ and $|S_2\rangle$ states are not symmetric under the permutations of the qubits; therefore only specific distributions of the qubits leads to the successful teleportation. For the $|S_1\rangle$ state, only when Bob has the qubit 2, the protocol works. This is because only second qubit has entropy as one. In the case of $|S_2\rangle$ state Bob can have any qubit, except the qubit 1.

We now consider the possibility of teleporting an unknown arbitrary two-qubit state $|\psi\rangle_{ab} = \alpha|00\rangle_{ab} + \beta|01\rangle_{ab} + \gamma|10\rangle_{ab} + \delta|11\rangle_{ab}$. It would be possible with only a few four-qubit entangled states. For any type of teleportation of an arbitrary and unknown two-qubit state to succeed, the entropy of the Bob's two qubits should be two. For the teleportation of the restricted subclass, with two arbitrary parameters, the entropy needs to be one only. In such a situation, one can find suitable measurement vectors. The $|\Omega\rangle$ state be used to teleport an arbitrary two-qubit unknown state for all appropriate distributions of qubits, except the partition of (1,4) and (2,3) qubits. We can see the protocol by rewriting the six-qubit state as [17]

$$\begin{aligned}|\psi\rangle_{ab}|\Omega\rangle_{1234} = \\ \sum_{i=1}^{2}[|\Omega_+^i\rangle_{ab12}\, U_+^i\, |\psi\rangle_{34} + |\Omega_-^i\rangle_{ab12}\, U_-^i\, |\psi\rangle_{34} + \\ |\Omega_+^{i+2}\rangle_{ab12}U_+^{i+2}|\psi\rangle_{34} + |\Omega_-^{i+2}\rangle_{ab12}U_-^{i+2}|\psi\rangle_{34} + \\ |\Omega_+^{i+4}\rangle_{ab12}U_+^{i+4}|\psi\rangle_{34} + |\Omega_-^{i+4}\rangle_{ab12}U_-^{i+4}|\psi\rangle_{34} + \\ |\Omega_+^{i+6}\rangle_{ab12}U_+^{i+6}|\psi\rangle_{34} + |\Omega_-^{i+6}\rangle_{ab12}U_-^{i+6s}|\psi\rangle_{34}]/4, \quad (6)\end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned}|\Omega_\pm^i\rangle &= (|0\rangle|\eta_i^+\rangle|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle|\eta_i^-\rangle|1\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \\ |\Omega_\pm^{i+2}\rangle &= (|0\rangle|\eta_i^-\rangle|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle|\eta_i^+\rangle|1\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \\ |\Omega_\pm^{i+4}\rangle &= (|0\rangle|\eta_i^+\rangle|1\rangle \pm |1\rangle|\eta_i^-\rangle|0\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \\ |\Omega_\pm^{i+6}\rangle &= (|0\rangle|\eta_i^-\rangle|1\rangle \pm |1\rangle|\eta_i^+\rangle|0\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \quad (7)\end{aligned}$$

Here $i = 1, 2$ and $|\eta_1^\pm\rangle = |\varphi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle)$, and $|\eta_2^\pm\rangle = |\psi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle \pm |10\rangle)$. $U_\pm^i$ are appropriate unitary operators.

The GHZ state is not a suitable resource state for the teleportation of an arbitrary unknown two-qubit state. However, an entangled two-qubit state $|\psi_1\rangle_{ab} = \sigma_i\sigma_j(\alpha|00\rangle_{ab} + \beta|11\rangle_{ab})$ can be teleported. One can teleport the state because the entropies of two-qubit subsystems of the GHZ-state is one. This state superficially looks like one-qubit state. Similarly, in the case of the $|W\rangle$-state the two-qubit subsystems have entropy one, so one can teleport some subclasses of arbitrary two-qubit states. For example, one can teleport the state $|\psi_2\rangle_{ab} = \alpha|00\rangle + \beta|\psi^+\rangle$. In the case of $|S_1\rangle$ and $|S_2\rangle$ states, two-qubit subsystems have entropy more than one but less than two. Surprisingly, although two-qubit subsystems have larger entropy than in the case of W-state or GHZ-state, but cannot teleport even the subclasses of states. Therefore, *a larger entanglement does not necessarily help in teleportation*.

For the teleportation of a general three-qubit state, one would need an entangled state of six qubits [17]. From the Table I, we see that the maximum entropy of three-qubit subsystems for the states under consideration is one. Therefore

one can teleport at most a state with two terms only. For example, although one can use $|\Omega\rangle$ state to teleport a two-qubit state with four unknown parameters, but it can teleport a three-qubit state with only two unknown parameters.

III. CONDITION FOR TELEPORTATION

We saw in the last section that the entropy of the subsystems of the given resource entangled state plays an important role. Now we ask the question that if we are given a n-qubit state with m terms to teleport, what kind of resource state is needed? In a reverse way, the question can be posed as: given a resource state, what are the states that can be teleported using this resource? The answer to this question tells us that why sometimes a more entangled state is less suitable.

Theorem: A resource state is useful to teleport an unknown n-qubit state which has m terms if and only if the resource states qubits could be distributed in such a way that the receiver's n qubits have entropy $\log_2 m$.

Proof: Let us consider an unknown n-qubit state with m-terms that Alice wishes to teleport to Bob

$$|\Psi\rangle_n = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \alpha_k |\eta_k\rangle_n. \tag{8}$$

The state is normalized and the basis set is orthonormal

$$\langle \eta_k|\eta_l\rangle = \delta_{kl}, \qquad \sum_{k=1}^{m} |\alpha_k|^2 = 1. \tag{9}$$

Let the resource state be a N-qubit state. For this resource state to be useful, we should be able to write it as,

$$|R\rangle_N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{l=1}^{m} |\chi_l\rangle_{N-n} |\eta_l\rangle_n. \tag{10}$$

Here the states $|\chi_l\rangle_{N-n}$ may not be orthonormal. The combined state can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle_n |R\rangle_N &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i |\eta_i\rangle_n |\chi_k\rangle_{N-n} |\eta_k\rangle_n \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m} |\eta_i\rangle_n |\chi_k\rangle_{N-n} \alpha_i |\eta_k\rangle_n. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Alice will now make a measurement in an orthonormal basis $|\theta_l\rangle_p$. Therefore, we should be able to write

$$|\eta_i\rangle_n |\chi_k\rangle_{N-n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{l=1}^{m^2} C_{ik,l} |\theta_l\rangle_N. \tag{12}$$

The $C_{ik,l}$ is an interesting object. For each l, it is a $m \times m$ matrix in 'ik' space. It is also a $m^2 \times m^2$ matrix with row label as ik. We need to find a condition on $C_{ik,l}$ such that we indeed have a suitable measurement basis. Using the above equation

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle_n |R\rangle_N &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{l=1}^{m^2} C_{ik,l} |\theta_l\rangle_N \alpha_i |\eta_k\rangle_n \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m^2} |\theta_l\rangle_N \sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m} C_{ik,l} \alpha_i |\eta_k\rangle_n. \end{aligned}$$

For the teleportation to succeed, we should have,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m} C_{ik,l} \alpha_i |\eta_k\rangle_n = V^l \sum_{n=1}^{m} \alpha_n |\eta_n\rangle_n. \tag{13}$$

Taking its adjoint and scalar product with itself, we get,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{i'=1}^{m} C_{ik,l} C^*_{i'k,l} \alpha_i \alpha^*_{i'} = 1. \tag{14}$$

This condition is true for each l,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{i'=1}^{m} (CC^\dagger)_{ii',l} \alpha_i \alpha_{i'} = 1. \tag{15}$$

For this equation to be satisfied, we must have

$$(CC^\dagger)_{ii',l} = \delta_{ii'}. \tag{16}$$

This suggests that C is unitary in 'ik' space for each l for teleportation to succeed. Let us now see what it means for the resource state.

Taking the adjoint and the scalar product,

$$\langle \eta'_i|\eta_i\rangle \langle \chi'_k|\chi_k\rangle = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m^2}\sum_{l'=1}^{m^2} C_{ik,l} C^*_{i'k',l'} \langle \theta_l|\theta'_l\rangle, \tag{17}$$

$$\delta_{ii'} \langle \chi'_k|\chi_k\rangle = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m^2} C_{ik,l} C^*_{i'k',l}. \tag{18}$$

Multiplying by $\delta_{ii'}$ and summing over i' and i, we get,

$$\langle \chi'_k|\chi_k\rangle = \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{l=1}^{m^2} (C^\dagger C)_{kk',l}. \tag{19}$$

Since C is unitary in the subspace, we get

$$\langle \chi'_k|\chi_k\rangle = \delta_{kk'}. \tag{20}$$

Therefore $|\chi_k\rangle$ should be orthonormal for the exact teleportation. Thus the resource state should have the form

$$|R\rangle_N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{l=1}^{m} |\chi_l\rangle_{N-n} |\eta_l\rangle_n, \tag{21}$$

with both $|\chi_k\rangle$ and $|\eta_l\rangle$ being orthonormal. So, the entropy of the reduced density matrix of the Bob's qubits would be $\log_2 \mathrm{m}$.

Conversely, if the entropy of the reduced density matrix of the Bob's qubits is $\log_2 \mathrm{m}$ then we can always find a measurement basis given in (12) so that one can do faithful teleportation of n-qubit state with m-terms.

What we have shown is that if we wish to teleport a n-qubit state with m terms, then we should be able to distribute resource states qubits in such a way such that Bob's n qubits have entropy $\log_2 m$. Given a resource state, we can compute entropy of all the partitions. If there is a partition where Bob's n qubits have entropy as $\log_2 m$, then the state with m terms can be teleported with that partition.

IV. SUPERDENSE CODING AND ENTROPY

We now discuss the superdense coding capacity of various entangled states under discussion. There are three possible scenarios. In the scenario 1 (SN1), Alice has one qubit of the resource state; in the scenario 2 (SN2), Alice has two qubits of the resource state; in the scenario 3 (SN3), Alice has three qubits of the resource state. In each case, Bob has the rest of the qubits of the resource state. For all such distributions, they follow the standard superdense coding protocol to transmit a classical message. In this protocol, Alice applies unitary operations $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, i\sigma_2, \sigma_3$ with equal probabilities on her qubits and sends them to Bob. Bob performs a joint measurement on all the four qubits to retrieve the original message. Since some states are asymmetric with respect to the permutation of qubits, the distribution may affect the superdense coding capacity of the states. The capacity mainly depends on how many orthogonal states are obtained using unitary transformations by Alice. This is because orthogonal states can be perfectly distinguished. Therefore, the task is to find out the number of orthogonal states that can be obtained by unitary operations on the particles possessed by the sender.

The superdense coding capacity also appears to depend on the entropy of the subsystem on which Alice applies the unitary operations. This is specially true for maximal superdense coding. It also seems to be the case for non-maximal superdense coding, as we will see below. The $|\Omega\rangle$ state is the best quantum resource from the point of view of superdense coding. The classical capacity in the $SN1$ scenario is two classical bits (cbits) irrespective of distribution of the qubits, as the entropy of each individual qubit is one. In scenario $SN2$, Alice can transmit four cbits by transmitting two qubits with specific distributions of qubits. The entropy for the subsystems (1,2) or (1,3) is two, while it is one for the subsystem (1,4). Therefore, the classical capacity is 4 cbits when Alice has subsystems (1,2) (or (3,4)) or (1,3) (or (2,4)), but it is three cbits when Alice has the subsystem (1,4) (or (2,3)). To illustrate this let us consider the case when Alice has particles 1 and 2. On applying unitary transformations, $\sigma_k \otimes \sigma_\ell \otimes \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_0$ $(k,\, \ell = 0, 1, 2, 3)$, the sixteen orthogonal states are obtained. Therefore, clearly the classical capacity is four cbits which is the maximum possible.

The $|GHZ\rangle$ state is symmetric under the permutation of particles. In the scenario SN1, Alice can produce four orthogonal states, so she can transmit 2 cbits of information. This is possible because the entropy of the Alice's qubit is one. In the scenario SN2, Alice applies unitary operations on her two qubits, giving only eight orthogonal states. It allows Bob to access only three cbits. In the scenario SN3, Alice can transmit four cbits of information. In general using n-qubit GHZ-state one may be able to send n bits of classical information by sending $n-1$ qubits. We note that this state is not suitable for maximal superdense coding. For the W-state, in the scenario $SN1$ and $SN3$, this state is not suitable for superdense coding because the entropy of Alice's subsystem is less than one. However a variant of this state, $|W_{mn}\rangle$, [13, 17] can be used. In $SN2$ scenario, Bob can access three cbits, because the two-qubit subsystems have the entropy as one.

For the $|S_1\rangle$ state the success of the protocol depends on the distribution of the particles between the parties. In the $SN1$ scenario, the protocol succeeds only when Alice has the qubit 2. This is because the entropy of this qubit is one. Other qubits have individual entropy 0.81 which is less than 1. In the scenario $SN2$, if Alice has qubits (1,2) and she applies unitary operations on her qubits, she gets eight orthogonal states. Therefore the capacity with this distribution is three cbits. However, if Alice has qubits (1,3) or (1,4), then unitary transformations yield at most four orthogonal states. So there is no enhancement in the classical capacity. We note that the entropy of the subsystem (1,2) is 1.5, while it is 1.22 for the subsystems (1,3) and (1,4). Here, we observe that there is an enhancement in the capacity for the entropy 1 (as earlier) and 1.5, but not for all values greater than 1. Surprisingly, the capacity of superdense coding is two cbits in spite of the entropy of two qubit subsystem being greater than one. It should be noted a similar observation is made in case of entangled qudits [19]. In the $SN3$ scenario, Alice will be able to transmit four cbits by sending three qubits only when she has qubits 1, 3 and 4. This is, as earlier, because only qubit 2 has entropy as one. We observe that when Alice has qubits (1,2), she can do superdense coding, but she would not be able to teleport a state. So we have a situation where *a state is suitable for exact superdense coding but not for exact teleportation*. For the $|S_2\rangle$ state, the distribution of the qubits is also important. The protocol can be implemented in the $S1$ scenario for all possible distribution of qubits except when Alice has the qubit 1. In the SN2 scenario, like $|S_1\rangle$ state, we can use the state for superdense coding for all distributions. This is because now all such partitions have entropy 1.5. The channel capacity, in each case is 3 cbits. It appears that after 1, the entropy value of 1.5 has special significance. This state is not suitable for exact teleportation, but can be used for non-maximal superdense coding.

V. QUANTUM KEY DISTRIBUTION

In this section, we consider the quantum information processing task of quantum key distribution (QKD) and show that it works well with lesser amount of shared entanglement. Let

us consider 2 four-qubit states – $|GHZ\rangle$ and $|S_1\rangle$, which were defined earlier. Let us suppose that Alice and Bob possess two qubits each. We see from Table I that the two-qubit subsystems of $|S_1\rangle$ state have more entanglement than the two-qubit subsystem of the $|GHZ\rangle$ state. However, we will see that $|S_1\rangle$ state cannot be used in a variant of BB84 QKD scheme [5] while $|GHZ\rangle$ state can be used. Let us consider $|GHZ\rangle$ state, given in (1) . Here Alice holds the qubits 1 and 3 and the remaining two qubits 2 and 4 are with Bob. In the Bell basis $\{|\Phi^+\rangle, |\Phi^-\rangle, |\Psi^+\rangle, |\Psi^-\rangle\}$, $|GHZ\rangle$ state can be re-written as

$$|GHZ\rangle_{1234} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi^+\rangle_{13}\,|\Phi^+\rangle_{24} + |\Phi^-\rangle_{13}\,|\Phi^-\rangle_{24}) \quad (22)$$

Here, $|\Phi^{\pm}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle)$ and $|\Psi^{\pm}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle \pm |10\rangle)$. In the next step, Alice randomly performs measurements on her particles in either $\{|00\rangle, |11\rangle\}$ basis or in the basis $\{|\Phi^+\rangle, |\Phi^-\rangle\}$. The information is encoded by using the two binary digits 0 and 1. If the measurement outcome is $|00\rangle_{13}$ ($|\Phi^+\rangle_{13}$) then 0 is encoded and if the measurement outcome is $|11\rangle_{13}$ ($|\Phi^-\rangle_{13}$) then 1 is encoded. After Alice's measurement, Bob also randomly chooses either the basis $\{|00\rangle, |11\rangle\}$ or the basis $\{|\Phi^+\rangle, |\Phi^-\rangle\}$ and then performs measurement on his particles in that basis. In the next stage, Alice publicly announces the basis in which she had measured the state of the particles but does not declare the measurement outcome. If Bob finds that his measurement basis matches with the Alice's basis, then he informs Alice to keep the data, otherwise the data is thrown out. In this way, quantum key can be distributed between Alice and Bob. Therefore, $|GHZ\rangle$ state can be used in generating the quantum key.

Now the question arises whether the state $|S_1\rangle$ is also suitable for this QKD scheme? To answer this question, we have to write the four-qubit state $|S_1\rangle$ in the computational basis as well as in the Bell basis. In the Bell basis, this state can be re-expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}|S_1\rangle_{1234} = \frac{1}{4}[&(2|\Phi^+\rangle_{13} + 2|\Phi^-\rangle_{13} + |\Psi^+\rangle_{13} + |\Psi^-\rangle_{13})\\ &|\Phi^+\rangle_{24} + (|\Psi^+\rangle_{13} + |\Psi^-\rangle_{13})\,|\Phi^-\rangle_{24}\\ &+ (|\Psi^+\rangle_{13} - |\Phi^-\rangle_{13})\,|\Psi^+\rangle_{24} - (|\Psi^+\rangle_{13}\\ &- |\Psi^-\rangle_{13})\,|\Psi^-\rangle_{24}]. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

From (4) and (23), it is clear that one cannot generate key even if their basis matches. Therefore, we have shown that although the four-qubit state $|S_1\rangle$ has more entanglement than $|GHZ\rangle$ state but the former cannot be used in the QKD protocol while the latter can. Similarly we can also see that the state $|S_2\rangle$ has more entanglement in bipartite partitions, but it is not useful for the QKD protocol. We note that the protocol will succeed for the $|W\rangle$ and $|\Omega\rangle$ states. It would appear that, like teleportation, only for specific values of the entropy of the subsystems, our QKD protocol will succeed. Therefore the resource state must have certain structure. One should be able to write the state as $\sum_{k=1} a_i|\varphi_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle$, where $\{|\varphi_i\rangle\}$ and $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ are orthonormal. The $|GHZ\rangle$, $|W\rangle$ and $|\Omega\rangle$ can be written in this form, but $|S_1\rangle$ and $|S_2\rangle$ states cannot be.

VI. CONCLUSION

Multipartite states allow many variations of the communication protocols that were introduced for bipartite states. We have considered a number of different genuine quadripartite entangled states as quantum resources for *exact* teleportation, superdense coding and quantum key distribution protocols. With a multipartite state as a resource, one can consider possibilities of teleporting multiple qubit states with different number of terms. We find that in such scenarios the phenomenon of "less is more" may occur. It means that depending upon the value of entropy, the resource state is either suitable or not suitable for the teleportation of an unknown state. To understand this we have obtained a condition that a resource state must satisfy for the protocol to succeed. In particular, we find that to teleport a m-term n-qubit state, a subsystem of the resource state must have entropy $\log_2 m$. So to be able to teleport a two-term two-qubit state, a subsystem need to have the entropy as one, but for a most general two-qubit teleportation, the required entropy is two. Therefore, a four-qubit GHZ state can be used to teleport a two-term two-qubit state but not the most general two-qubit state.

For the *exact* superdense coding, the capacity also seems to depend on the entropy of the subsystem on which Alice applies unitary transformations to encode the classical information. We also have a number of situations where one can encode more classical information by applying unitary transformations on a subsystem with smaller entropy. This again suggests that sometime "less is more". Furthermore, for some specific distribution of qubits, sometimes one can carry out superdense coding, but not the teleportation. It also appears that if Alice's subsystem has certain entropy then the superdense coding is possible. In particular for the maximal superdense coding, the Alice's subsystem should have maximal entropy, allowed for her number of qubits. We also find the concept of "less is more" holds for the quantum key distribution schemes. In general, it appears that the phenomenon of "less is more" is normal in the case of communications protocols involving multipartite state. We note that even when a resource state cannot be used to carry out a protocol deterministically, it can be used for probabilistic implementation of the protocol. However, it is always better to carry out a protocol exactly, with less entangled state, than carry it out probabilistically with more entangled state.

[1] C. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wooters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).

[2] C. H. Bennett and S. Wiesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2881 (1992).

[3] M. Murao, M. B. Plenio and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 032311 (2000).

[4] M. Hillery, V. Buzek and A. Berthiaume, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1829

(1999); R. Cleve, D. Gottesman, and H. K. Lo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 648 (1999).
[5] C. H. Bennett, and G. Brassard, in Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India, (IEEE, New York), 175 (1984).
[6] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).
[7] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, and H. Zbinden, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 145 (2002).
[8] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
[9] G. Gour, and N. R. Wallach, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 060502 (2013).
[10] S. S. Sharma, and N. K. Sharma, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 042315 (2012).
[11] J-L. Li, and C-F. Qiao, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **46**, 075301 (2013).
[12] F. Verstreate, J. Dehaene, B. De Moor, and H. Verschelde, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052112 (2002).
[13] P. Agrawal and A. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **74** 062320 (2006).
[14] P. Agrawal and B. Pradhan, J. Phys. A **43** 235302 (2010).
[15] P. Eberherd, Phys. Rev. A **47** R747 (1993).
[16] A. Acin, T. Durt, N. Gisin and J. I. Latorre, Phys. Rev. A 65 052325 (2002).
[17] See, for example, B. Pradhan, P. Agrawal and A. Pati, quant-ph/0705.1917; *ibid*, quant-ph/0805.2651.
[18] H. J. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, Phy. Rev. Lett. **86**, 910 (2001).
[19] S. Mozes, J. Oppenheim and B. Reznik, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 012311 (2005).